

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 and 27-42 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1-42 stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicants has amended the claims according to the Examiner's suggestions. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 8-29 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Ewert et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2001/0034586) in view of bake et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,330,621). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ewert is directed to a method for monitoring and controlling home security systems. As conceded by the Examiner, Ewert fails to disclose various aspects of claim 1. The Examiner relies upon Bakke to teach these aspects of applicant's claimed invention. However, as discussed extensively in applicant's previous response, modifying the system disclosed in Ewert with the teachings of Bakke fails to yield applicant's claimed invention. Of note, Bakke is not concerned with current media flows. Thus, Bakke fails to teach or suggest computing a weight score based on a description of current media flows or otherwise account for media flows when allocating devices for a requested operation. Likewise, Ewert fails to disclose this aspect of the

applicant's claimed invention. Claim 1 has been amended to further defined this aspect of the present invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over this combination of references.

The Examiner has indicated that Claim 40 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 40 has been rewritten in independent form, thereby placing it in condition for allowance. Similarly, Claim 27 has been amended to recite the subject matter of object to claim 40 and is also believe to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 1, 2008

By: /Timothy D. MacIntyre/
Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42,824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TDM/med